



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ization. It is the permanent Interparliamentary Committee, composed of ten representatives from different nations of Europe, having its seat and its managing officer at Berne charged with the duty of arranging for its future meetings, and, between the meetings, of watching the interests of the civilized world, of advising in case of need, and of convoking, if necessary, a special meeting of the Union. France is represented in this Committee by Mr. Trarieux. The Committee met from the tenth to the twelfth of October last at Brussels, where it was officially received by the Government, and after having decided that the meeting of the next Conference should be at The Hague it passed a certain number of resolutions of which the press of Europe has been informed.

We may now measure the advancement which has been made and by what has been accomplished form an idea of what can yet be done. Some, carried away by their desires and their good will, have an excessive idea of what has been done. To believe them, the cause of peace, which is nothing more than the cause of justice in international relations, is already completely and irrevocably gained. The Interparliamentary Union is nothing less than the nucleus of the States-General of humanity; and they see already in one of the future meetings of this Union an International Parliament, dominating, from the height of the general over the particular, the national parliaments, dictating, for the good of all, its laws to governments.

Let us beware of this exaggeration which is neither just nor without danger. In meeting as they do to talk over together the interests of their respective countries and the general interests of the world, the members of the different parliaments, who are drawn together by a common love of peace, do not mean either to relinquish their own independence or to attempt to interfere with that of the others. They remain what they are, lovers of their country and representatives of their nation. If on returning home, in accord with their foreign colleagues and conformably to the resolutions adopted by them, they have propositions to make in their own parliaments, invitations to address to their governments, they do it with full liberty, and it is from the free will of their governments that they expect favorable measures or responses.

But, these reserves made as they ought to be made, who does not see what influence manifestations like those in which they have taken part must necessarily have on the sentiment of the parliaments and on the decisions of the governments. It is, in the last analysis, in all countries which have a national representative body, the representatives of the nation which hold the purse strings. It is they, in a greater or less degree, who make and unmake ministries. Little or much, sooner or later, they must be taken into account. And though they might, in fact, be more or less dispensed with, though the national customs and traditions, the personal prestige of a sovereign or of a statesman might permit the executive power to believe itself above parliamentary votes, there are to-day, in the diffusion of public opinion, and, let us say it, in the conscience of sovereigns who are not, as some are pleased to say, insensible to humanitarian interests, and indifferent to the responsibility of their acts, secret and powerful forces working in the same direction. The day will come—it is perhaps not far off, and it would have come sooner, if private violence which threatens

social peace had not too often obstructed measures of justice, internal and external, taken up in government councils—the day will come when it will finally be recognized that the old policy of jealousy, of hatred and of rivalry is not only a policy void of greatness and of morality but that it is also an unintelligent, ruinous and perilous policy.

That which has been done between region and region, between province and province, will be done between nation and nation, not by the absorption of the ones to the profit or the detriment of others, but by the reconciliation of the ones with the others. Saint Paul has said that the nations are members of the same body. It has taken the world eighteen centuries to learn this, but it is beginning to refrain from shutting its eyes to the evidence. We cannot do without each other, and we can no longer do injury to others without damaging ourselves. At the point to which science, industry and commerce have brought the civilized portion of the globe, it is a living network no part of which can be broken without damaging the whole. Through every wound, made in any part of the body of humanity, the blood which is lost is the blood of the whole body. Whether one wish it or not, everything,—industry, commerce, arts, sciences,—is henceforth international. An army, in a country which it calls an enemy's, blows up a bridge, fills up a canal, burns a workshop; it is capital taken from the fortune of its own nation which served to construct this bridge, to dig this canal, to build this workshop; it is in the thatched cottage of the aged parents of the soldiers that are found the stocks and the obligations of this railroad and of this mine. War is no longer a crime only; it is an absurdity. It is no longer immoral and cruel only; it is beastly. It is no longer murder on a grand scale only; it is voluntary suicide and voluntary ruin.

THE HOLY ALLIANCE AGAIN.

To the Editor of THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE:

The views of the Holy Alliance, presented by Mr. Augustine Jones, in the January number of the *ADVOCATE*, and by Prof. C. A. Eggert in the February number, seem so at variance with those usually entertained—while they may be entirely correct—that it is not improper to call attention to the aspect in which that famous document, and the action of the three sovereigns under it, have been generally considered.

Text writers upon International Law seem generally agreed that at the time of the signing of the paper, there was very little meaning attached to it by the Emperor of Austria or the King of Prussia. Dr. Twiss (*Rights and Duties of Nations in time of Peace*, Ed. 1884, Sec. 231), states, that the signatures of these monarchs were appended to the document to humor the Emperor of Russia; and that “the Emperor of Austria expressed his conviction to Metternich and Castlereagh, that if the allies persisted in refusing altogether to sanction the Emperor's project, the effect might be seriously prejudicial to his mind.”

It is doubtless true that in the English Parliament the peace of 1815 was considered adversely by many eminent men, and especially by Sir James Mackintosh, Sir Samuel Romilly, Mr. Brougham and Francis Horner. The latter greatly distinguished himself in the debate. An abstract of his speech, taken from Hansard, is to be

found in the second volume of Horner's Life, at page 548. I make the following extract from it :

"But the most odious part of the late arrangement, which appeared from a treaty on the table, was, the league of arbitrary sovereigns to meet annually for the purpose of considering their interests; for what rational man could doubt what such sovereigns would, in the long run, consider their interests, how they would decide upon every indication of popular feeling, or upon any movement in favor of popular principles?" These questions Mr. Horner answered by a reference to the conduct of Austria toward Hungary and the Low Countries, and that of the three sovereigns in regard to Poland.

Sir Edward Creasy (*First Platform of International Law*, page 119) says:

"The practical policy (if not the original design) of the Holy Alliance was directed to the armed suppression of revolutionary movements in Europe, and to the forcible maintenance of old despotisms."

Manning (*Law of Nations*, *Amos*, Ed. 1875, p. 492) says, "it (the Holy Alliance) has now become identified with a set of principles which the sovereigns who framed the alliance afterwards thought proper to pursue, and those principles I join with others in believing to be such as no confederacy of sovereigns has a right to maintain in their treatment of other independent States."

The circular of the three Powers, issued from Troppau 8th December, 1820, will be found in Metternich's Memoirs (Vol. 3, p. 445); from that I make the following extract:

"The Powers exercise an indisputable right in contemplating common measures of safety against States in which the Government has been overthrown by rebellion, and which, if only an example, must consequently be treated as hostile to all lawful constitutions and governments. The exercise of this right becomes still more urgent when revolutionists endeavor to spread to neighboring countries the misfortunes which they had brought upon themselves scattering rebellion and confusion around." This, unquestionably, is an expression of the views and purposes of the signatories to the Holy Alliance.

Mr. Stapleton, who was Mr. Canning's private secretary, author of a "Political Life of Canning" (1831), and "Canning and his Times" (1859), may be supposed to have had some knowledge in regard to this matter. In 1866, his book, entitled "Intervention and Non-Intervention," was published, and at page 28 he treats of the Holy Alliance. I make the following extract:

"Whether it was from the mere dread of the prevalence of these opinions" (popular principles) "that the Holy Alliance originated, or whether it arose, as Lord Castlereagh indicates in his dispatches, out of an insane and pious fanaticism with which at that time the mind of the Emperor Alexander seems to have been affected, certain it is that that memorable treaty was signed before the Congress separated; and whether it was or was not intended by its imperial originator to work as it did, there can be no doubt that in fact this Alliance was nothing else but an union of despotic sovereigns in order to aid each other in protecting their absolute authority from the popular encroachments of their own subjects. For this end they acted as a sort of European police, first as far as possible to prevent any popular outbreak; but if that ailed, then to join in suppressing it in every country where it might happen to triumph. For sometime their

efforts for prevention were successful; but in the fourth year of their existence, constitutional privileges were demanded by the people, and conceded by the sovereigns of Naples, Piedmont, Spain and Portugal.

"Forthwith the Holy Alliance determined that England's principle of abstinence from forcible interference should be no impediment to their forcible interposition; and at the Congresses of Troppau and Laybach, measures were concerted for putting down the newly granted constitutional privileges of Piedmont and Naples, and restoring absolute powers to their respective sovereigns." Subsequently the same combination supported France in the overthrow of the liberal government of Spain. Next came Portugal."

Walker, one of the latest writers upon International Law (1893), at page 143, says:

"The first sovereigns to break the peace of Europe were the originators of the 'Holy Alliance.'" Undoubtedly the Holy Alliance was followed by the armed intervention on the part of one or more of the signatories to the famous document, and so important, frequent and impressive have these armed interventions been, that Walker concludes his review with this sentence (p. 151):

"To write the history of subsequent interventions would be to write the history of the century."

The ground and scope of these interventions were most extraordinary. Mr. Montague Bernard in his Lecture on Intervention (p. 13) describes it:

"The allied sovereigns in effect declared at Laybach that the revolution in Naples nearly and evidently endangered the essential interest of the Russian Empire."

Doubtless all will agree that the principles declared on the face of the *Personal League* are commendable, and desire to see them universally prevalent. And yet when such an arrangement is followed by a series of acts, such as have been referred to, one feels just a bit unwilling to join in the eulogy of the entire proceeding.

The late Henry Winter Davis terms the acts of the three arbitrary sovereigns "commentaries on the Holy Alliance"; indeed they show what the League in fact was.

C. B.

NEW YORK, 7th March, 1894.

THE MILITIA SYSTEM.

BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, LL.D.

(From the *Young Men's Era*.)

I am asked to give my judgment as to the influence of the militia system of the United States on the young manhood of the country. Coming as it does from a journal specially devoted to the Christian character building of young men, the request means, doubtless, that the estimate should be given from the Christian standpoint; the only standpoint, in the last resort, from which Christians are at liberty to judge of any system or course of action. I confine myself strictly to the question proposed, and do not take up that of the national defence, which would require a separate paper.

Comparing the influence of the militia system, as it now exists and has existed in the past, with that of the standing army, we find in most particulars the difference to be one of degree rather than of kind. Any one who